DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 509 SP 025 966

AUTHOR Marso, Ronald N.
TITLE Supervisor Assessments of Inservice Education Planning Practices: Collaboration and Competency Concerns.
PUB DATE Sep 84
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, September 26-29, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Assessment; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Needs Assessment; *Participative Decision Making; *Program Effectiveness; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Teacher inservice education coordinators working with approximately 130 school districts were asked to report on their use of, and to rate the effectiveness of, 11 planning practices. The study's purpose was to determine if the emphasis in the literature of the past decade on collaborative planning and needs assessments beyond a teacher survey appears to have influenced their receptivity to, or use of, these particular practices. It was hypothesized that the coordinators would express an interest in investigating additional collaborative planning efforts for the region, and would report a low present use but high effectiveness rating for competency-related needs assessment strategies. In general the survey responses confirmed these hypotheses, and indicated that the emphasis on collaborative planning among educational organizations and on more diversified needs assessment approaches has yet to make a significant impact on teacher inservice planning practices. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED255509

Supervisor Assessments of Inservice Education Planning Practices: Collaboration and Competency Concerns

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Marso

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Midwestern Educational Research Association
1984 Annual Meeting

Chicago, September 26-29

Ronald N. Marso
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

SP025966

AUTHOR

MARSO, RONALD N. Address: College of Education, Bowling Green University, Bowling Green, Ohio 43403. Title: Professor. Degrees: B.A. Dakota State, M.A. Adams State, Ed.D. University of Nebraska. Specialization: Educational Psychology and Measurement.

Abstract

Teacher inservice education coordinators working with approximately 130 school districts were asked to report on their use of and to rate the effectiveness of eleven planning practices. The purpose of the study was to determine if the emphases in the literature of the past decade on collaborative planning and needs assessments beyond a teacher survey appears to have influenced their receptivity to or use of these particular practices. It was hypothesized that the coordinators would express an interest in investigating additional collaborative planning efforts for the region and would report a low present use but a high effectiveness rating for competency related needs assessment strategies. In general the survey responses confirmed these hypotheses and indicated that the emphases on collaborative planning among educational organizations and on more diversified needs assessment approaches has yet to make a significant impact on teacher inservice planning practices.

Supervisor Assessments of Inservice Education Planning Practices: Collaboration and Competency Concerns

Dr. Ronald N. Marso

Bowling Green State University

Teacher inservice education has been characterized by an absence of coordination among educational units as: 1) a body of highly imprecise language, 2) highly politicized, and 3) lacking an understanding of content (Rubin, 1978). Further, teacher inservice needs assessment approaches of the past have been characterized as merely an annual survey of teachers (Mangieri & McWilliams, 1976). Few question that teacher surveys are valuable and informative, but many question whether interests and preferences are being assessed by the surveys rather than the needs of teachers, learners and schools (Jones and Hayes, 1980; Wood and Thompson, 1980).

In the past decade teacher inservice education has experienced a renewed emphasis on the positive values of collaborative efforts and a news media blitz with accompanying public outcry related to concerns of competency, accountability, and decreasing student test scores (Yarger, 1983). Supposedly, collaboration was to bring both more resources and more cooperatively successful efforts to bear on inservice education, and the emphasis on actual teacher and learner performance was to provide tangible goals to address in needs assessment and training. Both quality and quantity increases in teacher inservice training are imperative in making schools more effective during this period of slower new teacher recruitment.

Currently, we do not know whether the emphases on collaborative efforts and competencies in assessing inservice needs have influenced inservice education planning practices or if area inservice coordinators are receptive to these proposed approaches. Additionally, we have little information on preferred planning practices among county, city, elementary, or secondary inservice coordinators or how practices might differ among these groups. Is there, for example, sufficient agreement among these groups in their perceptions of inservice planning practices that collaboration is feasible?

PROBLEM

The general purpose of this study was to determine the perceived effectiveness and reported frequency of collaborative planning efforts and competency related needs assessment practices of area public school inservice education coordinators. The following six hypotheses were stated for the study.

1) The inservice coordinators will rate the effectiveness of direct surveys of teachers in assessing inservice needs below the median of the identified inservice practices.

2) The inservice coordinator will rate the effectiveness of collaborative efforts with nonpublic school organizations below the median of the identified inservice practices.

3) Effectiveness ratings of the identified inservice practices will not vary significantly between coordinators employed by county or city and exempted village schools or among coordinators with secondary, elementary, or general assignments.

4) The percentages of reported use of the identified inservice practices will not vary significantly between coordinators employed by county or city and exempted village schools or among coordinators with secondary, elementary or general assignments.

5) The percentages of reported use of the direct assessment practices will be below the median for the identified practices while the effectiveness ratings for the direct assessment practices will be above the median for the identified practices.

6) The inservice coordinators will report an interest in and high potential effectiveness rating for a collaborative, regional resource center to improve teacher inservice education.

METHOD

The designated population for the survey was made up of all city, exempted village, and county school systems within a relatively rural twenty county region of Northwest Ohio served by two state universities and three private colleges. The metropolitan Toledo area schools and the area parochial schools were not included in the study. A total of 61 school systems were surveyed of which 20 were county school systems, 25 were city school systems, and 16 were exempted village school systems. The 20 county school systems contacted served more than 90 local school districts bringing the total school districts involved in the study to approximately 130.

The study was conducted during the spring of 1983. Survey instruments were sent directly to the school superintendent of each identified school system. Each superintendent was provided with two survey forms designated as elementary supervisor or secondary supervisor. The cover letter to the school superintendent requested

that he use his discretion as to what member(s) of his staff could best respond to the survey. Previous experiences in these schools indicated that in some school districts a single individual coordinated inservice efforts rather than having traditional elementary or secondary school inservice and supervisory assignments. A total of 56 usable surveys were returned from the 61 school systems contacted.

INSTRUMENT

The survey instrument consisted of two components, each one page in length. The first component consisted of a listing of eleven items describing inservice planning practices within four categories: 1) Direct Contacts: surveys of teachers and of principals and supervisors; 2) Inservice Committees: school building, school system, and regional-county groups; 3) Direct Assessments: computerized support with standardized test scores, classroom observation, and student rating of teacher data; and 4) Resources and Support Systems: university and school study groups, national and regional information centers, and State Department of Education and regional professional associations.

Each survey item in the first component required a "yes" or "no" response indicating whether the identified planning practice was commonly used and a rating of the practice as being currently or potentially effective. These effectiveness ratings were made on a five-point Likert-type scale with one as highest and five as lowest.

The second component of the survey instrument asked the respondents to indicate their interest in a Northwest Ohio collaborative resource center designed to assist area supervisors in

planning and providing for teacher inservice education. They were asked to indicate whether they would likely support such an effort and whether their school system would probably encourage them to participate in such a collaborative effort. Each respondent was also asked to rate the potential effectiveness of such a center on a five-point Likert scale item with one being highest and five being lowest.

RESULTS

The responses to the survey were grouped for analysis by school organization, city or exempted village and county school, and by the nature of the respondent's job assignment--elementary, secondary, or general curriculum. Responses to each item were tallied, percentage computed, mean rating calculated on the five-point Likert scale items, and mean ratings ranked relative to the other Likert items and sample groupings. These data are reported by question item and category in the following paragraphs and in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Direct Contacts: The respondents reported very frequent use of the teacher survey (82%) and of the principal and supervisor survey (75%) in planning inservice programs. The reported use of these planning practices was higher than any other single category as was expected. The mean effectiveness ratings for the teacher survey was 2.40 resulting in a rank order of eight among ten ranked planning practices. The respective mean rating and rank for the direct survey of principals and supervisors were 2.22 and five. The diversity of ratings on each item was greater within this category than for any other single category suggesting some disagreement about the effectiveness of these two most frequently used planning practices.

It is interesting to note that the potential effectiveness ratings by those not using these two practices were ranked relatively higher at five and three rather than eight and five respectively for the teacher and principal and supervisor surveys. The response patterns between current usage and potential ratings were not, however, significantly different statistically.

As the direct teacher survey planning practice was ranked below the median effectiveness rating of 2.25, hypothesis one was accepted. A null hypothesis of only a random response to the rating response to this practice was rejected at $p < .001$, X^2 of 20.99, df = 4.

Two differences were noted among the respondent groupings within this category. A difference in the frequency of reported use of principal and supervisor direct survey was noted among general, elementary, and secondary assigned groups. Elementary coordinators reported less frequent use of principal surveys than did secondary (X^2 of 3.70 df = 1, $p < .10$) or general coordinators (X^2 of 8.78, df = 1, $p < .01$). Additionally, the general coordinators rated the principal and supervisor survey as more effective than did either the elementary or secondary coordinators (X^2 of 9.13, df = 6, $p < .10$).

Inservice Committees. Within this category the respondents reported very common use of school system groups (82%), school building groups (71%), and regional-county groups (53%) in planning inservice programs. Effectiveness ratings for these items were also reported as high ('1' or '2') 62%, 59%, and 60% respectively. Both the school system and regional-county planning group effectiveness ratings resulted in an overall ranking higher than for the school building group, ranks of 3, 4, and 6, respectively.

The responses of the total sample of inservice coordinators indicate that they most commonly work with school system inservice committees; however, significant variations among the group comparisons were evident. Only 25% of the city and exempted village coordinators reported working with county or regional inservice committees as compared to 81% of the county coordinators. This difference is significant at $p < .001$, X^2 of 29.95, df = 1. Similarly, 93% of the city/exempted village coordinators reported working with school systems inservice committees while only 70% of the county coordinators reported doing so (X^2 of 4.67, df = 1, $p < .05$). Among the grade level assignment grouping, percentages of reported use of the various inservice committees were not significantly different, but the school system inservice committees were rated as more effective by the general assignment coordinators than by elementary or secondary coordinators ($X^2 = 8.09$, df = 4, $p < .10$).

Direct Assessments. The respondents reported a relatively common use of student performance on standardized tests (58%) but very infrequent use of teacher observations (15%) and student ratings of teachers (4%) in assessing inservice training needs. Those respondents using these three practices did not report a single low (4 or 5) rating in this category. The frequency of reported use was very low on the latter two items, and the response frequency on item eight was judged to be too low to include it in the item rankings for the practices being used. The responses to the potential effectiveness of these two latter practices suggest strong and diverse views. This category was ranked highest in effectiveness but lowest in frequency of reported use in support of hypothesis five.

Insufficient numbers of respondents reported using teacher observations and student ratings of teachers to allow statistical comparisons. The effectiveness ratings of the student performance on tests planning practice were high for all groups and not statistically different among the groups. Differences were noted, however, among the reported use on this item. Fewer secondary coordinators (28%) reported using this direct assessment practice than did either the elementary coordinators (X^2 of 7.64, df = 1, $p < .01$) at 71% or the general assignment coordinators (X^2 of 4.41, df = 1, $p < .05$) at 85%.

A comparison of ratings by those who do and those who do not use the practices in this category suggests a rather diverse range of perceived effectiveness with proportionately more low ratings among those coordinators not using teacher observations and student ratings of students in planning inservice activities. Rankings of the ratings in this category are near the top for those using these practices and near the bottom for those not using these practices. The low frequencies reported for this category prevent a statistical analysis of differences on these two items.

Resources and Support Systems. The respondents reported a highly common practice of working with the State Department of Education (78%), a less common practice of working with university-school-teacher groups (35%), and a somewhat less common practice of working with nationally or regionally sponsored information resource centers (31%). High ratings (1's and 2's) were given for the current effectiveness of these practices, 52%, 55% and 36% of the respondents, respectively while no lowest ratings (5's) were given to any of the items in this category.

The effectiveness ratings for this category as a whole are lower than for any other category with university, regional, and State Department support systems ranked respectively seventh, tenth, and ninth. This supports hypothesis two suggesting that nonpublic school collaborative efforts rank below the median for the identified group of inservice practices. The effectiveness ratings for the regional and State Department items by those coordinators not currently using these practices were lower than the current use ratings with only the regional and county committee planning item ranked lower. In contrast, university support system item ranked four on potential effectiveness as compared to a rank of seven for the currently effective rating rank. This might suggest a receptiveness to working with universities among some of the coordinators.

Comparisons among the various groups of respondents did not result in any significant difference in ratings within this category. Three differences in percentages of coordinators reporting use of the practices were noted. A total of 89% of the county office coordinators reported working with the State Department of Education category while only 68% of the city and exempted village school group reported doing so (X^2 of 3.56, df = 1 $p < .07$). Among the grade level assignment groups fewer secondary coordinators (11%) reported working with university support systems while 46% of the elementary coordinators (X^2 of 5.73, df = 1, $p < .02$) and 54% of the general assignment coordinators (X^2 of 3.54, df = 1, $p < .07$) reported doing so.

Survey Component Two. This component of the survey was designed to assess the potential effectiveness of and supervisor interest

supervisors in a collaborative regional resource center for teacher inservice training. The characteristics of this center were described as follows: To be designed for supervisors in support of their role in improving classroom effectiveness through inservice education; to provide assistance in computerized assessment processes in identifying inservice education needs; to provide computerized lists of resources and materials available on given inservice topics; and to provide a collaborative support system for supervisors in identifying inservice needs, training resources, and effective training practices.

Responses to the second survey component were as follows:

1. Your assessment of the potential value of such a center

(highest)	1	2	3	4	5	(lowest)
responses:	42%	40%	17%	0%	0%:	MEAN = 1.74

2. You would likely support and participate in such a program?

Yes: 71%; Unsure: 29%; No: 0%

The mean effectiveness rating for the proposed collaborative effort was 1.74 which is significantly higher than that of any other item. Compared to the highest rated potential effectiveness item, school system groups with a mean of 2.22, the effectiveness rating of the proposed collaborative effort is rated significantly higher at the $p < .01$ level of confidence (X^2 of 9.91, df = 2). Compared to the highest rated currently effective item, student performance on standardized tests with a mean of 2.09, the effectiveness rating on the proposed collaborative effort is rated significantly higher at the $p < .08$ level of confidence (X^2 of 5.21, df = 2).

The pattern of responses to the likely support and participation in such a program item is also very favorable. Seventy-one percent of

the supervisors reported that they would likely participate while none said they would not. This response pattern is sufficient to reject a null hypothesis of a random response at the $p < .001$ level of confidence (X^2 of 25.02, df = 2). Thus both the effectiveness rating of the proposed collaborative effort and the percentage indicating likely participation support hypothesis six.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Hypothesis one: This hypothesis was accepted since the inservice coordinator rating of direct teacher surveys was ranked below the median rank for the total set of identified inservice practices. This planning practice was ranked eighth in effectiveness among the ten rankable items. The direct teacher survey was one of the most frequently reported planning practices, but the diversity of the effectiveness ratings on the item suggested some concerns with this planning practice.

Hypothesis two: As the rating of the nonpublic school category of resources and support systems resulted in rankings below any other category, hypothesis two was accepted. The university, regional, and State Department of Education resources were ranked seven, nine, and ten in terms of current effectiveness. University resources were rated more favorably on both current and pctential effectiveness in this category and attained a rank of four on potential effectiveness ratings.

Hypothesis three: None of the comparisons of current effectiveness ratings on individual planning practices among the coordinator groups resulted in differences significant at the $p < .05$ level of confidence although two comparisons reached the .10 level.

Thus, hypothesis number three was accepted. A Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis of variance by ranks among the elementary, secondary, and general assignment coordinator group rankings of effectiveness was also completed resulting in a nonsignificant H value of 1.004. The Spearman rank correlation between the county and city and exempted village school group rankings was .32, while the Kendall coefficient of concordance among the elementary, secondary, and general assignment ranks was .39.

Although not directly related to this hypothesis, it was noted that the mean potential ratings as a group were significantly lower than the current practice ratings (X^2 of 8.68, df = 1, $p < .01$). It was noted also that the county coordinators rated the total set of current inservice practices higher than did the city and exempted village coordinators (X^2 of 12.80, df = 1, $p < .001$). Both of these statistical comparisons were median tests of independence.

Hypothesis four: This hypothesis was rejected because several differences in reported use of the identified inservice practices were noted among the coordinator comparison groups. Significant differences in percent of use were reported between the city and exempted village group and the county school group on items four, five, and eleven involving use of inservice committees and State Department of Education resources. Similarly, significant differences in use were reported among the elementary, secondary, and general assignment coordinators on items two, six, and nine involving direct surveys of principals and supervisors, inservice committees, and university resources.

Hypothesis five: The percentage of coordinators reporting use of the direct assessment category of items was below the median for the set of planning practices and lower than any other category. Secondly, the effectiveness ratings of this same set of items were above the median for the total set of planning practices. Thus, hypothesis five was accepted.

The single item in the direct assessments category with a relatively high reported use was the assessment of student achievement planning practice (58%). The frequency of reported use for student ratings of teachers (4%) was so low that it was excluded from the rankings of the items in current use. It was noted that the rankings of the potential effectiveness of the teacher observations and student ratings of teachers planning practices were relatively lower than the rankings of current effectiveness. Along with low reported current use, this may indicate some concerns about the use of these two plan practices.

Hypothesis six: The inservice coordinators reported an interest in the potential effectiveness of a collaborative regional resource center for inservice education and rated it highly. Not a single respondent indicated unwillingness to participate in such a center, and the rating of its potential effectiveness was significantly higher than any other practice rated by the coordinators. Thus, hypothesis six was accepted.

In summation, all of the stated hypotheses except number four were accepted. Significant differences were found among the coordinator groups in reporting the use of principal surveys, inservice committees, student achievement assessments, university

support services, and State Department of Education resources causing the rejection of this hypothesis.

Two general implications for teacher inservice education planning would seem to be supported by the results of this sample and survey. The data suggest that teacher inservice planning coordinators might be receptive to further collaborative planning efforts as suggested by this emphasis found in the inservice literature of the past decade. It also appears that university involvement in this collaborative planning might be viewed positively even though most current collaborative efforts appear to be limited to other public school units and systems. Furthermore, it appears that differences in planning practices and in views of which practices work are not so diverse as to preclude the success of regional collaborative efforts.

Second, the direct assessments category of planning practices appears to offer inservice coordinators a potentially high return for increased planning efforts. This category of items, standardized tests, teacher observations and student rating, is ranked highest in terms of effectiveness by the total sample while having a low frequency of use. Further, it appears that inservice coordinators might value a broadening of needs assessments as the most commonly reported practice of teacher survey earned the lowest current effectiveness ranking among the direct contact and direct assessment categories. The responses to this survey do not suggest that the public and professional emphases on competencies and performance common to the educational literature of the past decade have led to more sophisticated needs assessment practices in providing teacher inservice education. It would appear that both collaborative efforts

and competency oriented planning practices need to be further refined to strengthen inservice training activities in meeting the current achievement test criterion demands for more effective schools.

REFERENCES

Jones, L. L. & Hayes, A. E. (1980). How valid are surveys of teacher needs? Educational Leadership, 37, 390-392.

Mangieri, J. N., & McWilliams, D. R. (1976). Designing an effective inservice program, Journal of Teacher Education, 27, 110-112.

Rubin, Lewis (Ed.). (1978). The Inservice Education of Teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Wood, F. H., & Thompson, S. R. (1980). Guidelines for better staff development, Educational Leadership, 37, 374-378.

Yarger, J. J. (1983). In-service teacher education. In H. E. Mitzel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research, (Vol. 2, pp. 883-890). New York: The Free Press.

6/1

Table 1
Rating Effectiveness of Practices in Use

Planning Practices		Total Group	County Office	City Village	Elementary	Secondary	General
Direct Contacts:							
1. Direct surveys of teacher needs	Mean	2.40	2.30	2.50	2.58	2.38	2.00
	Rank	8	9	5.5	8	7	3.5
	Yes %	.82	.85	.79	.79	.89	.77
2. Direct surveys of principals and supervisors	Mean	2.22	2.10	2.32	2.60	2.31	1.64
	Rank	5	4.5	2	9	5	2
	Yes %	.75	.70	.79	.63	.89	.85
Inservice Committees:							
3. Recommendations from school building groups	Mean	2.28	2.25	2.58	2.26	2.23	2.38
	Rank	6	7.5	7	3.5	4	8
	Yes %	.71	.74	.68	.79	.72	.62
4. Recommendations from school system groups	Mean	2.16	2.05	2.23	2.26	2.33	1.63
	Rank	3	2	1	3.5	6	1
	Yes %	.82	.70	.93	.79	.83	.85
5. Recommendations from regional/county groups	Mean	2.18	2.10	2.43	2.29	1.77	2.33
	Rank	4	4.5	4	5	1	6.5
	Yes %	.53	.81	.25	.58	.50	.46
Direct Assessments:							
6. Computerized or other systematic analysis of student performance on standardized tests	Mean	2.09	2.06	2.38	2.18	2.20	2.20
	Rank	1	3	3	2	3	3.5
	Yes %	.58	.59	.57	.71	.28	.85
7. Computerized or other systematic analysis of classroom observations and evaluations of individual teachers by supervisors and building principals	Mean	2.13	2.00	2.50	1.50	2.67	2.33
	Rank	2	1	5.5	1	9	6.5
	Yes %	.15	.22	.07	.17	.17	.23
8. Computerized or other systematic analysis of student ratings of teacher performance	Mean	1.50	1.00	2.00	.00	2.00	1.00
	Rank	*	*	*	*	*	*
	Yes %	.04	.04	.04	.00	.06	.08
Resources and Support Systems:							
9. University/school/system/teacher study groups for identifying resources and needs	Mean	2.39	2.18	2.71	2.36	2.00	2.67
	Rank	7	6	9.5	6	2	10
	Yes %	.35	.41	.29	.46	.11	.54
10. Resources sought from nationally and regionally sponsored information centers devoted to teacher inservice	Mean	2.65	2.60	2.71	2.63	3.00	2.40
	Rank	10	10	9.5	10	10	9
	Yes %	.31	.37	.25	.33	.22	.38
11. Resources sought from the State Department of Education and regional professional associations supporting teacher inservice activities	Mean	2.41	2.25	2.65	2.42	2.58	2.10
	Rank	9	7.5	8	7	8	5
	Yes %	.78	.89	.68	.79	.72	.85

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2
Rating Effectiveness of Practices Not Used Currently

Planning Practices		Total Group	County Office	City Village	Elementary	Secondary	General
Direct Contacts:							
1. Direct surveys of teacher needs	Mean	2.56	2.25	2.80	2.25	2.00	3.33
	Rank	5	5.5	5	3.5	1.5	10
	No %	.18	.15	.21	.21	.11	.23
2. Direct surveys of principals and supervisors	Mean	2.42	1.71	3.40	2.29	2.00	3.00
	Rank	3	1	10	5	1.5	8
	No %	.25	.30	.21	.38	.11	.15
Inservice Committees:							
3. Recommendations from school building groups	Mean	2.58	2.00	3.40	2.00	3.00	3.00
	Rank	6	2.5	10	1.5	8	8
	No %	.27	.26	.29	.21	.28	.38
4. Recommendations from school system groups	Mean	2.22	2.25	2.00	2.00	2.33	2.50
	Rank	1	5.5	1	1.5	4	2.5
	No %	.18	.30	.07	.21	.17	.15
5. Recommendations from regional/county groups	Mean	3.28	2.00	3.40	3.00	2.83	3.29
	Rank	11	2.5	10	11	7	6
	No %	.47	.19	.75	.42	.50	.54
Direct Assessments:							
6. Computerized or other systematic analysis of student performance on standardized tests	Mean	2.26	2.22	2.30	2.33	2.08	3.00
	Rank	2	4	2	6.5	3	8
	No %	.40	.37	.43	.29	.22	.15
7. Computerized or other systematic analysis of classroom observations and evaluations of individual teachers by supervisors and building principals	Mean	2.71	2.44	2.75	2.25	2.69	2.70
	Rank	7	8	4	3.5	5	4
	No %	.85	.78	.93	.83	.83	.77
8. Computerized or other systematic analysis of student ratings of teacher performance	Mean	3.14	3.19	3.10	3.11	3.25	3.50
	Rank	8	9	8	8	9.5	11
	No %	.95	.93	.96	1.00	.94	.92
Resources and Support Systems:							
9. University/school/system/teacher study groups for identifying resources and needs	Mean	2.52	2.38	2.67	2.33	2.80	2.16
	Rank	4	7	3	6.5	6	1
	No %	.65	.59	.71	.54	.89	.46
10. Resources sought from nationally and regionally sponsored information centers devoted to teacher inservice	Mean	3.16	3.25	3.07	3.29	3.40	2.71
	Rank	9	10	7	9	11	5
	No %	.67	.59	.71	.54	.89	.62
11. Resources sought from the State Department of Education and regional professional associations supporting teacher inservice activities	Mean	3.18	3.67	3.00	3.40	3.25	2.50
	Rank	10	11	6	10	9.5	2.5
	No %	.22	.11	.32	.21	.28	.15

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

Likert Ratings of Inservice Planning Practices

A. Planning Practices Currently Used

Item No.	N1	%	N2	1 (high) f	%	2 f	%	3 f	%	4 f	%	5 (low) f	%	Mean	Rank
1	45	.82	45	9	.20	18	.40	11	.24	5	.11	2	.04	2.40	8
2	41	.75	41	11	.27	17	.41	8	.20	3	.07	2	.05	2.22	5
3	39	.71	39	10	.26	13	.33	12	.31	3	.08	1	.03	2.28	6
4	45	.82	45	15	.33	13	.29	12	.27	5	.11	0	0	2.16	3
5	29	.53	28	9	.31	8	.29	8	.29	3	.11	0	0	2.18	4
6	32	.58	32	7	.22	15	.47	10	.31	0	0	0	0	2.09	1
7	8	.15	8	2	.25	3	.38	3	.38	0	0	0	0	2.13	2
8	2	.04	2	1	.50	1	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.50	*
9	19	.35	18	2	.11	8	.44	7	.39	1	.06	0	0	2.39	7
10	17	.31	17	2	.12	4	.24	9	.53	2	.12	0	0	2.65	10
11	43	.78	41	6	.15	15	.37	17	.41	3	.07	0	0	2.41	9

B. Planning Practices Not Currently Used

Item No.	N1	%	N2	1 (high) f	%	2 f	%	3 f	%	4 f	%	5 (low) f	%	Mean	Rank
1	10	.18	9	2	.22	1	.11	5	.56	1	.11	0	0	2.56	5
2	14	.25	12	2	.17	6	.50	2	.17	1	.08	1	.08	2.42	3
3	15	.27	12	3	.25	3	.25	3	.25	2	.17	1	.08	2.58	6
4	10	.18	9	2	.22	4	.44	2	.22	1	.11	0	0	2.22	1
5	26	.47	18	1	.06	4	.22	5	.28	5	.28	3	.7	3.28	11
6	22	.40	19	3	.16	8	.42	8	.42	0	0	0	0	2.26	2
7	47	.85	38	7	.18	9	.24	14	.37	4	.11	4	.11	2.71	7
8	52	.95	42	6	.14	9	.21	10	.24	7	.17	10	.24	3.14	8
9	36	.65	31	2	.06	14	.45	12	.39	3	.10	0	0	2.52	4
10	37	.67	31	2	.06	5	.16	13	.42	8	.26	3	.10	3.16	9
11	12	.22	11	0	0	3	.27	5	.45	1	.09	2	.18	3.18	10

N1 = number responding to current or not current use of the practice.

N2 = number rating the effectiveness of the practice.

* = too few responses to rank this item, ranking of only ten items.

6/1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE